ಇನ್ನು ಸಹಕಾರದ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಪ್ರಾಕ್ಟಿಕಲ್ ಆಗಿ ಜನರು ತೊಂದರೆಪಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕೇಂದ್ರೀಯ ಸಹಕಾರ ಭೂಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕು ಈವರೆಗೆ 33,800 ಬಾವಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಲು ದೀರ್ಘಾವಧಿ ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ರೈತರು ಒಂದು ಮತ್ತು ಎರಡು ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಟಾಲ್‌ಮೆಂಟುಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಬಾವಿ ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಯಾಗಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಅದನ್ನು ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಬೇರೆ ಕಡೆ ಸಾಲ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಷ್ಟರಲ್ಲಿ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕಿನಿಂದ ಹಣ ಕಟ್ಟಿ ಎಂದು ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಪುನಃ ಬಾವಿ ತೆಗೆಯಲು ಹಣ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಫೈನಲ್ ಬಿಲ್ ಆಗದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ರೈತನ ಗತಿ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ? ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಏನು ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡಿದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ? ಅವನು ಇದರಿಂದ ಕಷ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿದಂತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೇ ? ಮೊದಲು ಅವನ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಉತ್ತಮ ಪಡಿಸಿ. ಅವನಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟುಬಿಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆವಶ್ಯಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅವನಿಗೆ ರಿಯಾಯಿತಿ ತೋರಿಸಿ. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ವೆಂಕಟಗಿರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಸೆಂಟ್ರಲ್ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಮಾರ್ಟ್‌ಗೇಜ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಶೇಕಡ 90 ಭಾಗ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಪ್ರೈಮರಿ ಮಾರ್ಟ್‌ಗೇಜ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್‌ನವರು ಏನೂ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಅವನು ಆವರಿಗೆ ಒಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಎರಡರಷ್ಟು ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಆಧಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾನೆ. ಆವರೂ ಒಂದು ಕಂತು ಕಟ್ಟದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಅವನನ್ನು ಕಷ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿಸಬೇಡಿ. ಅವನಿಗೆ ರಿಯಾಯಿತಿ ತೋರಿಸಿ. ಈಗ ನೀವು ಶೇಕಡ 90 ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟು ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ವಸೂಲ್ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಏನು ಒಂದು ರೂಲ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅದನ್ನು 50 ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟಿಗೆ ಇಳಿಸಿ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಾಲ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು, ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು, ಕೋಅಪರೇಷನ್ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಪರಿಹಾರ ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಗಳ ವಿಷಯ. ನಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಅದನ್ನು ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ತುಮಕೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ 4 ದಿವಸ ಮಾತ್ರ 11, 12 ಇಂಚು ಮಳೆಯಾಯಿತು. ಜಮೀನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ತೇವ ಆಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಿಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಶಾಶ್ವತವಾದ ಖಾಯಂಪರಿಹಾರ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಭಾಗವಾಗಿ 64 ಫ್ಯಾಮಿನ್ ಹೆಡ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಾವಿಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸಾವಿರಾರು ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳೂ ಬಂದಿವೆ. ಈಗ ಬಾವಿಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಎತಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ ? ಬಾವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನೀರು ಬರವೇ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಸಾಲ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬಿಡುತ್ತೀರಾ ? ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಷಯ ಏನೆಂದರೆ ಮಾಗಡಿ ಪಾಳ್ಯದ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಗೆ ಆಡಿಟರ್ ಹೋಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಏನೂ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗದಂತೆ ನೋಡಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ, ನನಗೆ ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ವಂದಿಸಿ, ನನ್ನ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಹೆಚ್. ಸಿ. ಬೋರಯ್ಯ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ನಿನ್ನೆ ದಿವಸ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ಠರಾವಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಜವಾಬು ಕೊಡುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರ ಭಾಷಣಕ್ಕೆ ಜವಾಬು ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಜವಾಬು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಅರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿರಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಅಂದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದಂಥ ನಂಜೇಗೌಡರು ಎಂ. ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಟಿ. ಸಿ. ಮೇಲೂ ಮತ್ತು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಮೇಲೂ ಕೆಲವು ಗುರುತರವಾದ ಆಪಾದನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Point of order whether a Minister can reply to points raised in connection with No-confidence Motion already disposed of while replying to debate on Motion of Thanks.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH (Mudigere).—I rise to a point of order, Sir The Hon. Deputy Minister while opening his speech, he was pleased to say that he is now replying to the remarks made during the debate on the motion of no-confidence. He prefaced his speech by saying to that effect. In fact, the reply to the Motion of Thanks can only be given by

(SRI K. H. RANGANATH)

the Mover of the motion namely Sri D. M. Siddiah. In fact, we are not in the chapter of no-confidence. That chapter is over. Probably the Deputy Minister does not know many of the rules. It is not in order now for the Hon. Deputy Minister to reply to the debate that took place in respect of the no-confidence motion today. Now the reply has to be in respect of the Motion of Thanks.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—In substantiating the point of order raised, I wish to draw attention to rule 288 of the Rules of Procedure, which clearly lays down that a Member while speaking shall not reflect on any determination of the Assembly except on a motion for rescinding it. The Hon. Chief Minister or any Minister who was replying to the debate on that particular motion, could have replied to all points raised. Otherwise, it only means that Governmennt has no answer to those points. That is the only inference that can be drawn. No member is entitled to speak about that motion because the debate is over and the House has also given its determination because it has been put to vote. Any attempt to reply to those points amounts to a reflection on the decision of the House. I therefore submit that the Hon. Deputy Minister may not be permitted to refer to those matters which have been discussed at the time of no-confidence motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER —The Minister will reply to the debate on Motion of Thanks. In the meanwhile he is not prevented from touching on other points.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Rule 288 (iv) says : that a Member should not reflect on any determination of the Assembly except on a motion for rescinding it.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, the point before the House is the Motion of Thanks to the Governor. The Hon. Deputy Minister prefaced his speech by saying that he is going to reply to the points raised in connection with the no-confidence motion yesterday. That means that motion is still alive. But that motion has been already decided upon and disposed of.

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL.—Sir, I wish to submit to the Hon. House that yesterday when I was replying to the debate on the no-confidence motion in the beginning itself, I made it clear that several allegations were made and several observation were made but, I am going to confine myself only to one issue, that is, the judgement passed by the High Court and also the Supreme Court in regard to the excise sales in Myosre State. I also said that with the permission of the Chair, I am taking another opportunity because I knew that opportunity was going to come to me today while replying to the debate on the Motion of Thanks. I said so far as the other allegations and charges are concerned, I will reply to them today. Instead of my replying to all the points, I requested my colleagues to reply to some of the points. If I alone have to

reply to all the points, it will take a lot of time. I cannot dwell on those points in greater detail. That is why I have requested other Ministers and believe the Government has got every power to make a statement and clear the position in respect of allegations made on any Minister or the Government.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—Sir, the point is, that we are not guided by our wishes. We are to be guided by the rules of procedure. Yesterday, we had the no-confidence motion and that is over. It was put to vote and disposed of. It was decided by the House. In fact the Hon. Chief Minister did exercise the right of reply. Even rule 294 was applied. If he could not reply to some of the points raised yesterday, we can only draw the inference that the Government had nothing to say in the matter.

But during the Motion of Thanks to the Governor, he wants to reply to the points which were raised in the course of discussion on no-confidence motion. That would not be according to rules. That is not in order. That is my respectful submission.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA (Periyapatna).—Sir, it may be said that the Chief Minister yesterday evaded answering some of the serious allegations made against the Government at the time of the no-confidence motion. We cannot prevent him from saying anything he wants. Or he may not say. But now when the Motion of no-confidence is not before us, if a Member wants to speak and specifically says that he is replying to the points raised at the time of the no-confidence motion, to say the least, it becomes irrelevent, and it is not in order. I can see the force of the argument put forward by the Hon. Chair. We cannot prevent a member from saying what he wants or what he feels. But the Chair can prevent any member from saying what is irrelevant. What is relevant for discussion now is the points that have been referred by the Members of this House on the Motion of Thanks. If any Members wants to cover all subjects from Cape Camorin to Himalayas, it is certainly for the Chair to say that it is irrelevent and he may confine himself to the point at issue.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—Sir, I further raise the point that under the rules the Minister has no right of reply. That is the point I am trying to canvass here. The Hon. Chair has given a ruling yesterday. The right of reply vests under rule 294 only with the mover of the motion, who in this case is Sri D. M. Siddiah and he alone can have the right of reply. The Council of Ministers has no right of reply. At best they can seek your permission to speak or intervene in the debate. But it cannot be considered as reply and if Sri D. M. Siddaiah does exercise his right of reply, it has only to be inferred that these proceedings are recorded and there is no reply. This Ministry has no right of reply.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Government has got a right of reply. Rule 22 provides for such a right of reply and I cannot curtail the right of reply of Government.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, may I draw your attention to rule 22 ?

Sri D. M. SIDDAIAH.—In supporting the motion, the Minister has got a right of reply under Rule 22.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—It is only right of explanation and not a reply. If the Hon. Chief Minister wants to give an explanation, it can be done. Under rule 22 he has no right of reply. Under rule 294 any other member has a right of speaking with the permission of the Chair. That is what I am submitting. If the Chief Minister is now allowed, then Sri D. M. Siddiah will lose the right of reply.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair].

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎನ್. ನಂಜೇಗೌಡ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ರಂಗನಾಥ್‌ರವರು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪ ಎತ್ತಿದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಮಾತನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನನ್ನ ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗಿದೆ. ಸರಕಾರ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅವರ ಅನುಕೂಲಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕಂತೆ ತನಗೆ ತಾಪತ್ರಯವಾಗುವ ಸಂಗತಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಉಳಿದ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರಬಹುದು. ಬಹುಶಃ ನಾವು ಮಾಡಿದ ಆಪಾದನೆಗಳಿಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ಸರಕಾರದ ಪಕ್ಷದವರೂ ಸೇರಿ ಓಟ್‌ಡೌನ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೋ ಏನೋ. ನನ್ನ ಆ ಒಂದು ಭಯದಿಂದ ಪ್ರಬಲವಾದ ಆಪಾದನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡದೆ ಇವೇಡ್ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಇವತ್ತು ಒಂದು ಗಂಡಾಂತರ ಕಳೆದಿದೆಯೆಂದು, ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ಆಪಾದನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿದರೆ ನಾವು ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವೇನಾಗಿದೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಮಾಡಿದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬಾರದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.—On a point of order, Sir. I have heard with attention what the Chief Minister stated. He could not answer all the allegations made by the members and that is why he reserved one point raised in the no-confidence motion and he wants to divide other points amongst other Ministers. During the no-confidence motion several other points were raised by members. My submission is, that the Chief Minister cannot do so. Why I am saying is, rule 22 says that the Chief Ministsr or any other Minister can explain. Rule 22 specifically provides for right of explanation on the motion of thanks and not on the no-confidence motion. In the circumstances the Chief Minister can reply by way of explanation. Secondly he can do or some other Minister may do but not both. Subsequently it also states "at the end of the discussion". It means one person can have the right of reply and not all persons. Supposing one Minister has to say something and he is permitted, the other Ministers also can be permitted. But that is not envisaged in rule 22. It specifically states Chief Minister or any other Minister and not all Ministers. That is the interpretation of rule 22. Then, the Chair also has to fix up the time.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I believe the member credits the Presiding Officer with intellegence enough to understand him.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಪೇಕ್ಷೆ ಪಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ರೂಲ್ 25ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಿ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಮತ್ತು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ನಿಲುವನ್ನು, ಧೋರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿರೂಪಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—I want to make a clarification.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does the member want to obstruct the hon. Minister? I have permitted the Hon. Minister to state the views of the Government.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದಂತಹ ಕೃಷ್ಣನ್‌ರವರು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—I want to say afew words before the hon. Minister speaks.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I request the hon. Member to allow the hon. Minister to finish his speech.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—He is misinterpreting. Let me explain the situation. My point of order was seized by the House and discussion was going on it. The point of order raised by me was quite different. The hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs was not present when I raised the point of order and dwelt on it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—At my request, the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs is explaining the position. After I heard Sri M. S. Krishnan, I wanted to hear the hon. Minister also with respect to the point of order so that he might help the Chair. So the hon. Minister may be allowed to state the point of view of the Government first.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—My point is this: when my point of order is under discussion, can the Chair simultaneously allow another point of order? Can you not kindly bear with me for a minute and allow me to explain the position?

Mr. SPEAKER.—First let the hon. Minister finish his statement. Then I shall hear Sri Ranganath.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನು ಏನು ಉದ್ದೇಶಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೆನೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಭಂಗ ಬರುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದಂತಹ ಕೃಷ್ಣನ್‌ರವರು 22ನೇ ರೂಲ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪ ಲೋಪವನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇರೆ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಬೇರೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳವರಾಗಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾದಂತಹ ಅಂಶಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ರೂಪವಾಗಿ ತಮ್ಮ ನಿಲುವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಈ ರೂಲ್ 22ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮುಂತ್ರಿಯವರು ಮತ್ತು ಅವರ ಸಹೋದ್ಯೋಗಿಗಳು ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಇದೆ. ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಚರ್ಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಂಶಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಮತ್ತು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಬಾಕಿ ಇತರ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾರ್ವನಿಕರ ಹಿತಾನಕ್ತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಾಧಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾದಂತಹ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ನಿಲುವು ಏನು ಧೋರಣೆ ಏನು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಕೂಡ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ ಅಂತ ನನ್ನ ತಿಳಿವಳಿಕೆ. ಆ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದಂತಹ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಕೃಷ್ಣನ್‌ರವರು ಎತ್ತಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಚ್. ರಂಗನಾಥ್.— ನಾನು ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಮುಂಚೆ ತಮ್ಮ ರಕ್ಷಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಈ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಅಫೇರ್ಸ್ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರು ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಒಂದು ತರಹ ದುರುಗುಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡು ನೋಡುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಅದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಈ ಮನೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯನಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನನಗೆ ಒಂದು ಹಕ್ಕು ಇದೆ. ಅವರೇನಾದರೂ ಆ ರೀತಿ ದುರುಗುಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡು ನೋಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಅವರ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು, I may be touchy. Even now, he is looking at me in that very fashion. You can see his face.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಹಸನ್‌ಮುಖಿಯಾಗಿಯೇ ನೋಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಚ್. ರಂಗನಾಥ್.—ದಯವಾಡಿ ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಕ್ಷಮಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ, ತಾವು ಅವರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು. ಅವರು ಏನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದರೆ ನಾವೆಲ್ಲ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಬಾರದವರು ಕಾಲಕಳೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಎತ್ತುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಆ ರೀತಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆಗೆ ನೋಡುತ್ತಾ ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ತಾವು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಬೇಕು.

Sri K, PUTTASWAMY.—The hon. Member seems to have mistaken me. There is no reason for me to stare at him or look at him.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—While the Hon. Deputy Minister for Transport and Tourism started replying today, he prefaced his speech by saying that he wanted to reply to some of the allegations made by the hon. Member Sri H. N. Nanje Gowda yesterday while speaking on the Motion of No-Confidence. Immediately I raised a point of order that to-day he could not do so because that Motion was not before the House, and the House, was not seized of it. The House is seized today only of the Motion of Thanks moved by Hon. Siddiah and in reply to that references made with regard to the Governor's Address could be replied and that the points raised during the speeches made on the No-Confidence Motions should not be replied. That was my point of order. My objection was that the Hon. Deputy Minister was not in order if he replied to the references made during the debate on the No-Confidence Motion. I was substantiating my point of order. In the meanwhile, the Hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs came to the House. Probably he might not have heard what was stated by the Deputy Minister for Transport in this House some time ago, The Hon. Member Sri M. S. Krishnan also might have come in the middle of my speech on my point of order. Sri Krishnan referred to rule 22 in respect of his point of order.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—A point of personal explanation with the permission of the Chair. I am sorry Sri Ranganath has mistaken me.

Sri H. N. NANJE GOWDA.—When this point was raised, the Hon. Speaker was in his Chamber. This was raised under Rule 288 (1).

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—It is a point of personal explanation. If you permit me I want to say a few words.

I am sorry, the Hon Member Sri Ranganath has mistaken me. I am sorry to say that I was not aware of the fact that he had raised a point of order earlier. I came a bit late from the Hon. Speaker's Chambers. Then Sri M. S. Krishnan who had raised a point of order under Rule 22, was speaking. Then you were pleased to give permission to me to put forth Government's views and I spoke. In the meanwhile, Sri Ranganath sought your permission to explain his point of order, once again. Had I known earlier that the House was seized by his point of order, I would never have interfered. I think I have with humility enough recognized that every Member of this House is as respectable as any other, either the Chief Minister or even the presiding Officer. I never lack in my respect or regard for any hon Member of this House.

MR. SPEAKER.—I heard the Hon. Members Sri Krishnan and Sri Ranganath and the Hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs as to the scope of the answer to be given on behalf of the Government. This rule has been interpreted in the past in a particular manner. The previous proceedings show that replies were given not only by one Minister but by a number of Ministers on behalf of the Government and that position obtains not only here but in other legislatures also. The interpretation of the words ' Chief Minister or any other Minister' means Chief Minister and other Ministers. Though the singular is used, the singular includes the plural also unless there is anything in the context prohibiting it. So I do not find any force in the point raised by the Hon. Member Sri Krishnan.

The second question is when the bebate is complete ? Every Minister is a member of this House and if he wants to intervene in the debate, no rule prohibits him from intervening before the final reply is given. Therefore, if the hon. Ministers want to intervene, I think there would be no objection to it and the Chair cannot prevent them from intervening. So, there is also no force in this point raised by the Hon. Member Sri Krishnan.

As regards the contents of the reply, several matters are included in the Governor's Address. All those matters and the matters contained in the amendments tabled by hon. Members are before the House and if the Hon. Minister wants to reply to them, I think there is no rule to preclude him.

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—Before the Chair completes the ruling, I whould like to submit the context in which the point of order was raised. The Hon. Deputy Minister prefaced his speech saying that he whould reply to the points raised by ths hon. Member Sri H. N. Nanje-Gowda yesterday on the no-confidence motion. Therefore, I raised the point of order. Now he cannot reply to the no-confidence motion since that is not before the House today.

MR. SPEAKER.—The reply can be with respect to the contents of the Governor's Address, the amendments Tabled by hon. Members and all the speeches made here.

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—The Deputy Minister prefaced his speech by saying that he wanted to reply to the allegations made by the Hon. Member Sri Nanje Gowda on the no-confidence motion. Therefore, my point of order is that he would not be in order to reply to the motion of no-confidence which concluded yesterday itself. That motion is not before the House today.

SRI H. N. NANJE GOWDA.—The difficulty is that the Deputy Speaker was in the Chair when the Deputy Minister rose to reply and you have come now. Therefore, if you find it difficult to follow what happened in your absence, you may refer to proceedings.

SRI S. SIVAPPA.—A simple proposition has been made complex. The present motion is so comprehensive that the Deputy Minister could

(SRI S. SIVAPPA)

reply to any speech, but he prefaced his speech by saying that he would reply to the points raised in the no-confidence motion. Therefore the Deputy Minister has gone wrong.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಬಿ. ಹ್ಯಾಲನಯ್ಯ (ಹಾನನ).—ನನಗೆ ನಂಬಿಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯುಗಳಿಗೆ ನಾನು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟೆ. ಇನ್ನುಳಿದ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ ಎಂಬ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಅದನ್ನೂ ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ವೀರೇಂದ್ರ ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ನಾನು ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಎಕ್ಸ್ಟ್ರಾಜ್ ಕೇಸಿನ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ನಾನು ಆ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನವರು ಮತ್ತು ಸುಪ್ರೀಂ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನವರೂ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದ ಕಾರಣ ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಷಯ ಗಳಿಗೂ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗ ಸಮಯ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ, ಆಪಾದನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾವೇರಿ, ಹಾರಂಗಿ ಹೀಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ವಿಚಾರಗಳು ಬಂದಿದ್ದವು, ಆದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಉಳಿದ ವಿಚಾರಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾವಾಗ ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದ್ದೇ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೆ.

Sri H. N. NANJE GOWDA.—The Deputy Minister has conveniently avoided replying yesterday. If the reply had been given yesterday, the sense of the House would have been different. Sub-rule (v) of rule 288 says that a member while speaking shall not reflect on any determination of the Assembly except on a motion for rescinding it. The Assembly has already voted on the no-confidence motion. If the matters raised in the no-confidence motion were to be replied today, it means that we are reflecting on the determination of the Assembly.

Mr. SPEAKER.—On the point whether there could be any debate on the motion of no-confidence which has been disposed of by this House, I have no doubt in my mind that the motion is over and no reference to that can be made now. But without making reference to the no-confidence motion the Hon. Ministers can refer to those matters in the course of their reply.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—I rise to a point of order, Sir. I recall to the memory of the Hon. Chair that yesterday a ruling has been given by the Chair that rule 294 is applicable to the Governor's Address. The motion has been moved by the hon. Member Sri Siddaiah and under rule 294 the right of reply is that of the hon'ble Member Sri Siddaiah. It does not mean that the Ministers cannot explain the position; they can do so with the permission of the Chair. They have started as if they have the right of reply; that is not so. They had certainly the right of explanation only with the permission of the Chair and that too after the mover has replied. Here the question is that the mover has not replied at all probably because he has nothing to reply and so the Government has no right to speak either by way of explanation or reply. Therefore, the Deputy Minister or the Chief Minister cannot be allowed to reply to this debate, and the motion may straightaway be put to vote and decision taken.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I cannot prevent the Hon. Ministers from interven, ing in the debate before the mover Sri Siddiah has spoken. Of course, he will also reply.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—The Hon. Member Sri Siddaiah has not at all attempted to reply. Now that the Government has come forward to reply, he has lost the right which he had. Now the qnestion is whether these people have now got the right of reply or not. I say they have lost the right of reply.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Why does the Hon. member say so?

Sri K. H. PATIL.—When the Hon. Deputy Minister rose the Deputy Speaker was in the Chair and he called upon him to reply.

Mr. SPEAKER. -He might have intervened at that time.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—No. A point of order was raised then. It was then pointed out that he was replying.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The way of speech is peculiar to each member whether he be a member or a Minister. If he were to reply to the points raised by Sri K. H. Patil he might say 'I want to reply to the points raised by Sri K.H. Patil.' That does not mean that he was replying. I take it that he was only intervening in the debate.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—I accept that every member has got a right to make his speech in a particular way. I have no objection to that. But if they claim that they have got a right of reply, it is certainly against the rule because the rule is very clear on that point.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Nobody can prevent them from intervening in the debate.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—My point is that the right of reply cannot be given to the Government again because he has started his speech as a right of reply.

Mr. SPEAKER.—After the mover of the motion replies, if the Chief Minister again wants to reply he may do so with the permission of the Chair.

Now, the Deputy Minister, Sri D. C. Boraiah, may reply without making a refe ence to the no-confidence motion which was rejected by this House.

Motion of Thanks to the Governor's Address

(Continued)

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿ. ಬೋರಯ್ಯ.—ಎಂ.ಎಸ್.ಆರ್.ಟಿ.ಸಿ.ಗೆ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಅಂಡ್ ರೆಗ್ಯುಲೇಷನ್ಸ್ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೋ ಅದು ನಿಜವಾದುದಲ್ಲ. ಅದರ ಆಡಳಿತವನ್ನು ಸುಸೂತ್ರವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ದಕ್ಷತೆಯಿಂದ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗಳೂ ಕೂಡ ಇವೆ. ಆಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಅಂಡ್ ರೆಗ್ಯುಲೇಷನ್ಸ್ ಇವೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ನೌಕರರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಕೇಡರ್ ಅಂಡ್ ರಿಕ್ರೂಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಸಹ ಇವೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದಕ್ಕೂ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಅಂಡ್ ರೆಗ್ಯುಲೇಷನ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ದಕ್ಷತೆಯಿಂದ ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಆಡಳಿತವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮುಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಎಂ.ಎಸ್.ಆರ್.ಟಿ.ಸಿ.ಗೆ ಚೇರ್‌ಮನ್ ಆಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಭಾರತ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲ.